

26. A method for communicating with a communications network over a subscriber line using a communications device, the method comprising:

assigning respective internal network addresses for a telephone and a computer;

translating between the respective internal network addresses and an external network address assigned to the subscriber line; and

routing voice and data signals between the telephone and the computer and the communications network over the subscriber line based on the assigned internal network addresses and the external network address assigned to the subscriber line.

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-26 are pending.

The final Office Action mailed December 19, 2002 rejected claims 17-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1, claims 1-3, 9-11, 13, 14, 17, 20, 23, 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by *Itoi* (US 6,456,625 B1), claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by *Borella et al.* (US 6,353,614 B1), claims 6-7, 12, 15, 18 and 22 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Itoi* (US 6,456,625 B1) in view of *Tönnby et al.* (WO 97/47127¹), claims 4, 5, 16 and 19 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Itoi* (US 6,456,625 B1) in view of *Awdallah et al.* (US 6,449,251 B1), claims 4, 5, 16 and 19 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Itoi* (US 6,456,625 B1) in view of *Gerszberg et al.* (US 6,452,923 B1), claim 8 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Itoi* (US 6,456,625 B1) in view of *Tönnby et al.* (WO 97/47127) and further in view of *Szeliga* (US 6,067,353), and claim 8 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based

¹Please note that this reference is incorrectly numbered in the Office Action as WO 97/46073.

on *Itoi* (US 6,456,625 B1) in view of *Tönnby et al.* (WO 97/47127) and further in view of *Yee et al.* (US 5,946,384).

With respect to the rejection of claims 17-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1, the Office Action asserts that the router was not described in the specification. Attention is respectfully directed to the specification, for example, page 7, line 22 - page 8, line 21.

“Voice over IP gateway 36 is connected to a processor 38 within module 2. **Processor 38 is deemed to comprise** a number of submodules including a **dynamic host conversion protocol/network address translation (DHCP/NAT) submodule**, a packet priority submodule **and an IP routing submodule**. These submodules may be either hardware modules or subroutines preprogrammed to processor 38” (emphasis added).

The processor 38 identified in the specification has the attributes of a router, including address translation in a DHCP/NAT submodule and including an IP routing submodule. Case law is clear that support for claimed features in the specification need not be verbatim. The written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 is therefore satisfied, and the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Turning now to the rejection of claims 1-3, 9-11, 13, 14, 17, 20, 23, 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by *Itoi*, claim 1 includes the feature that “routing means assigns internal network addresses to said telephone and said computer, respectively, and selectively routes voice and data signals from said telephone and said computer, respectively, **to and from said telecommunications network via said subscriber line** and based on said assigned internal network addresses” (emphasis added), and independent claims 9, 17, 25 and 26 include similarly worded features. These claims do not read on *Itoi* at least in that voice and data signals are routed via a **subscriber line**, to a **telecommunications network**.

No such arrangement is disclosed in *Itoi*, which relates only to connection of telephones and data terminals to a LAN, and fails to teach any connection of the LAN to a subscriber line. For example, *Itoi* column 10, line 48 - column 11, line 52, discloses a call control process as described in relation to Figure 10, solely in relation to telephone numbers corresponding to IP addresses, without any mention of accessing telephone numbers via the PSTN or via any other external telecommunications network. Further, element 102 in Figure 3b of *Itoi*, cited in the Office Action, is clearly labeled “LAN”, is referred to in the specification as a LAN, and is not therefore “a network interface for connecting to telecommunications network (WAN or Internet)”, as the Office action asserts. This rejection is therefore respectfully traversed.

Whereas the Office Action also rejected claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by *Borella et al.* in the alternative, these claims recite an “**external network address assigned to the subscriber line,**” which is nowhere described in *Borella et al.* Referring to FIG. 1 of *Borella et al.*, although network addresses are shown at router 26 and on the Internet/intranet side of router 36 at 39, between which there is no subscriber line, no external network address is shown at the side of router 36 leading to PSTN 32 that would be translated by router 26.

The Office Action refers to column 4, lines 25-37 of *Borella et al.* regarding the address translation function of router 26, but it can be seen from FIG. 1 that router 36 and network switch 40 are located between router 26 and PSTN 32. Column 3, lines 47-56 of *Borella et al.* discloses:

A network access provider 34 with a router 36 routes data packets to/from first computer network 12 to second computer network 30 and/or third computer network 32 through a second network switch 38 and/or a third network switch 40. In one embodiment of the present invention, first network 12 is a Small Office/Home Office (“SOHO”) Local Area Network (“LAN”), also called a “legacy” LAN, second network 30 is the Internet or an intranet, and third network 32 is a Public Switched Telephone Network (“PSTN”).

Network addresses at router 26, which is not an interface to PSTN 32, are not therefore “external network address assigned to the subscriber line,” as claimed in pending claims 25 and 26, as there is no subscriber line between router 26 and router 36. This rejection is therefore respectfully traversed.


Claims 4-8, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 22 are dependent claims, and are allowable for at least the reasons that the parent claims are allowable. Each of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is therefore traversed.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the objections and rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (703) 425-8508 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG & CARLSON, P.C.

Feb 19, 2003
Date


Alun L. Palmer
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 47838

10507 Braddock Road
Suite A
Fairfax, VA 22032
Tel. 703-425-8501
Fax. 703-425-8518